PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 2 8 DEC 2005

VIPO	F	₂ C	T

Avallagations of agentia file reference						
Applicant's or agent's file reference A4-233PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416				
International application No. PCT/US2004/038936	International filing date (day/month) 19.11.2004	year) Priority date (day/month/year) 20.11.2003				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC						
H01Q1/24		٠.				
·						
Applicant MOLEX INCORPORATED et al.		•				
MOLEX MOOTH OTHER SEAT	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.						
2. This REPORT consists of a total of	of 5 sheets, including this covers	sheet.				
3. This report is also accompanied b						
a. 🛛 sent to the applicant and to						
sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).						
sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.						
b ☐ /sent to the International F	Bureau only) a total of (indicate ty	pe and number of electronic carrier(s)) , containing a				
sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).						
Box Relating to Sequence	Listing (see Section Sec of the A	·				
4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:						
☑ Box No. I Basis of the opi	nion	·				
☐ Box No. II Priority						
☐ Box No. III Non-establishm	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
	of unity of invention					
☐ Box No. V Reasoned state applicability; cit.	No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
☐ Box No. VI Certain docume						
☐ Box No. VII Certain defects						
☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application						
	Data - 4	Latin of this report				
Date of submission of the demand		completion of this report				
17.06.2005		2005				
Name and mailing address of the international		ed Officer				
preliminary examining authority:						
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Marot-Lassauzaie, J						
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d		ne No. ±49 89 2399-2671				

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/038936

	•		
_	Box No. I Basis of the report	<u> </u>	
1.	With regard to the language, thi filed, unless otherwise indicated	is report is based on the international a under this item.	application in the language in which it was
	☐ This report is based on tran which is the language of a t	islations from the original language into translation furnished for the purposes o	the following language , f:
	☐ international search (und☐ publication of the international preliminary	der Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) ational application (under Rule 12.4) examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or	55.3)
2.	With regard to the elements* of have been furnished to the rece report as "originally filed" and ar	eiving Office in response to an invitation	rt is based on <i>(replacement sheets which</i> n under Article 14 are referred to in this
	Description, Pages		
•	1-10	as originally filed	\$
	Claims, Numbers		
	1-37	received on 21.09.2005	
	Drawings, Sheets		
	1/13-13/13	as originally filed	
	☐ a sequence listing and/or a	ny related table(s) - see Supplemental	Box Relating to Sequence Listing
3.	. The amendments have res	sulted in the cancellation of:	
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.		
	☐ the drawings, sheets/fig ☐ the sequence listing (sp	pecify):	
	☐ any table(s) related to s		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
4	 This report has been estab had not been made, since they Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c 	have been considered to go beyond the	s annexed to this report and listed below ne disclosure as filed, as indicated in the
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.		
	☐ the drawings, sheets/fig☐ the sequence listing (sp☐ any table(s) related to s	pecify):	en e
	* If item 4 applies, s	some or all of these sheets m	ay be marked "superseded."

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/038936

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-36

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-36

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-36

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2004/038936

Re Item V.

2

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2003/129950 A1 (KWAK MIN-WOO) 10 July 2003 (2003-07-10) D2: US 2002/084938 A1 (KIM SEONG-YUN) 4 July 2002 (2002-07-04)

around the hinge. A tuning part is connected to the antenna in the closed position. The claims are directed to the construction of the contacts of the tuning part around the hinge. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-15, 18-22, 25, 28-31 and 34 are directed to the construction of the hinge in general, while claims 6,13,16,23,26,32,35 specify a capacitive coupling and claims 7, 17, 24, 27, 33, 36 specify a projection (sliding contact) is used.

Generally speaking, flip phones connecting a tuning device to their antenna according to the position of the hinge are known from either D1 or D2. Therefore claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-15, 18-22, 25, 28-31 and 34 lack novelty (Article 33(2) PCT). Additionally, document D1 discloses a flip phone with capacitive connection 120, 121 for an antenna 122a and an antenna extension (tuning part) 124. Therefore claims 6,13,16,23,26,32,35 lack novelty over this document (Article 33(2) PCT).

The application is, in substance, directed to a flip phone with an antenna constructed

As to document D2, this prior art describes projecting contacts 22, therefore claims 7, 17, 24, 27, 33, 36 lack novelty over this document (Article 33(2) PCT). claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

Re Item VIII.

- 1. Although claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
- 2. It is clear from the description that the actual design of the antenna is different than

International application No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/US2004/038936

the one of either D1 or D2. In particular, neither in D1 nor in D2 is the tuning part in the shaft of the flip phone. The actual design of the antenna is also different (the application appears to use a meander antenna, which is almost entirely contained around the hinge). The examiner is of the opinion that these features are actually the ones that best define the invention. Since the independent claims de not contain these features they does not meet the requirement following from Article 6 PCT taken in combination with Rule 6.3(b) PCT that any independent claim must contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention.

Amending the claims to specify these essential features would solve the objection of lack of novelty raised under Item V at the same time.